

FILED  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.  
★ APR 25 2005 ★

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

P.M. \_\_\_\_\_  
TIME A.M. \_\_\_\_\_

-----X  
PETER BOGDAN and SILVANA BOGDAN,

Plaintiff,

01 CV 1910 (SJ)

- against -

MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER

STOLT-NIELSEN S.A., STOLT-NIELSEN  
TRANSPORTATION GROUP LTD.,  
STOLT-NIELSEN, INC., STOLT PARCEL  
TANKERS, INC., STOLT PRIDE, INC., STOLT  
INTEGRITY, INC., STOLT CONFIDENCE OF  
THE ISLE OF MAN, MITSUBISHI CHEMICAL  
CORPORATION, MITSUBISHI RAYON CO., LTD.,  
AMOCO CHEMICAL COMPANY, DAICEL  
CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD., BASF  
AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT, ARCO CHEMICAL  
COMPANY, B.P. CHEMICALS LTD., DOES 1-10,  
ABC CORPORATION 1-20, THE LUBRIZOL  
CORPORATION, UNION CARBIDE  
CORPORATION, BASF CORPORATION,  
OCCIDENTAL CHEMICAL CORP., CHEVRON  
USA INC., DOW BRAZIL, S.A., DOW  
INTERNATIONAL, B.V., LYONDELL CHEMICAL  
COMPANY, BP AMOCO CHEMICAL COMPANY,  
BP CHEMICALS LTD.,

Defendants.  
-----X

APPEARANCES:

ROBERT A. SKOBLAR  
53 North Dean Street  
Englewood, NJ 07631  
Attorney for Plaintiff

P.M.

**NELIGAN TARPLEY ANDREWS & FOLEY LLP**

1700 Pacific Avenue, #2600

Dallas, TX 75201

By: David L. Ellerbe

Attorney for Defendant Dow Corning

**FREEHILL, HOGAN & MAHAR, LLP**

80 Pine Street

New York, NY 10005

By: Mark Francis Muller

Attorney for Defendants Stolt-Nielsen S.A.,

Stolt-Nielsen, Inc., Stolt Parcel Tanker, Inc.,

Stolt-Nielsen Transportation Group Ltd., Stolt

Pride, Inc., Stolt Accord, Inc., Stolt Excellence,

Inc., Stolt Sincerity, Inc., Stolt Heron, Inc.,

Stolt Osprey, Inc., Stolt Integrity, Inc.

**DONOVAN LEISURE NEWTON & IRVINE**

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, NY 10112

By: Geoffrey Williams Millsom

Attorney for Defendants Union Carbide Corp.,

Dow Brazil, S.A., Dow International

**PHILLIPS, LYTLE, HITCHCOCK, BLAINE &  
HUBER LLP**

3400 HSBC Center

Buffalo, NY 14203-2887

By: Paul F. Jones

Attorney for Defendant Occidental Chemical Corp.

**McELROY, DEUTSCH & MULVANEY, LLP**

Wall Street Plaza

88 Pine St.

New York, NY 10005

By: Joseph P. La Sala, Robert Stanley Moskow

Attorney for Defendants Chevron USA Inc.,

Lyondell Chemical Company, BP Amoco

Chemical Company

MAYER, BROWN & PLATT  
1675 Broadway  
New York, NY 10019  
By: Thomas Michael Mueller  
Attorney for Defendant BASF Aktiengesellschaft

NELIGAN, TARPLEY, ANDREWS & FOLEY LLP  
1700 Pacific Avenue #2600  
Dallas, TX 75201  
By: David L. Ellerbe  
Attorney for Defendant Dow Corning Corp.

JOHNSON, Senior District Judge:

Plaintiff Miljenko Tadic ("Plaintiff") filed this action against Defendant Dow Corning Corporation ("DCC" or "Defendant") and numerous other Defendants. Presently before this Court is Defendant DCC's Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2), 12(b)(4), and 12(b)(6) based on the automatic stay, discharge, and discharge injunction proceedings of the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(a)(1), 1141(d)(1)(A), and 524(a)(2). Despite expiration of the deadline for filing responses, Plaintiff has neglected to respond to the Motion. For the reasons stated herein, Defendant's Motion is GRANTED pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).<sup>1</sup>

#### STANDARD OF REVIEW

Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides for the dismissal

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court finds that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) is the appropriate vehicle for dismissal. See, e.g., O'Loughlin v. County of Orange, 229 F.3d 871 (9th Cir. 2000). The Court therefore will not discuss the other proposed bases for dismissal.

of a claim for "failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). On a motion to dismiss a complaint under Rule 12(b)(6), a court "must accept as true all of the factual allegations set out in plaintiff's complaint, draw inferences from those allegations in the light most favorable to plaintiff, and construe the complaint liberally." Gregory v. Daly, 243 F.3d 687, 691 (2d Cir. 2001). The court should not dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim "unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

This Motion is unopposed. However, "even if a plaintiff does not oppose a motion to dismiss, a court should conduct an independent inquiry to determine whether the motion to dismiss has merit." Seaweed, Inc. v. DMA Product & Design & Marketing LLC, 219 F.Supp.2d 551, 553 (S.D.N.Y. 2002). This Court will therefore review the merits of the Motion, but will also accept the factual statements in the Motion as true since Plaintiff has not challenged the veracity of Defendant's statements.

### **DISCUSSION**

Defendant DCC filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code on May 15, 1995. This petition is being adjudicated by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. The Bankruptcy Court signed a Confirmation Order confirming DCC's plan of reorganization on November 30, 1999 ("the Confirmation Date").

Under the Bankruptcy Code, "the confirmation of a plan . . . discharges the debtor from any debt that arose before the date of such confirmation." 11 U.S.C. § 1141(d)(1). "Debt" is defined to include "liability on a claim," 11 U.S.C. § 101(12). In this case, the Complaint alleges exposure to hazardous chemicals between 1981 and 1984, and between 1988 and October 1998. These dates all precede the Confirmation Date, and given that Plaintiff has not provided the Court with any basis to conclude otherwise, the Court finds that the claims are discharged under Section 1141. Therefore, the Complaint does not state a cause of action for which relief can be granted and must be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

#### CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, Defendant Dow Corning Corporation's Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 19, 2005  
Brooklyn, NY

s/SJ

\_\_\_\_\_  
Senior U.S.D.J.